REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner are thanked for granting the Applicant an in-person interview on August 04, 2004. During the interview, several distinguishable features of the claimed invention were discussed (Summary of a few of these features are provided below for the Examiner's convenience). Nevertheless, the Applicant has further clarified the subject matter regarded as the invention solely in order to expedite prosecution. In addition, the title of the invention has been changed, per the Examiner's request. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is clearly patentable over the cited art. The Examiner's rejections are traversed fully below.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102

It is noted that Bapat *et al.* states that referring to Fig. 11A, the format of each row in the database tables preferably includes a field called the "fully distinguished name" (FDN) of a managed object followed by columns of data: Data 1, . . ., Data N. Preferably, the FDN for each row represents the tree path (through the managed object tree) for the managed object whose information is stored in that row. The tree path for an object may be represented in the form "/a/b/c/ . . ." where a, b, and c indicate nodes along the tree path. For example, an FDN can look like:

/systemid = "sys1"/owner = "accompany"/devicetype = "routter"/ . . . (*Bapat et al.,* col. 19, lines 24-36).

However, it is respectfully submitted that a <u>tree path</u> for an object does NOT teach defining a calculation expression associated with at least one record in a database, wherein the calculation expression that can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one field of said at least one record.

As noted by the Examiner, the Granted Permission Table shown in Fig. 15A of *Bapat et al.* defines <u>user</u> access rights (Final Office Action, page 2). However, it is very respectfully submitted the claimed invention recites defining a calculation expression associated with at least one <u>record</u> in a database. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Final Office Action, page 3), each

row expression in the Granted Permissions is NOT a mathematical process evaluated by the FDN field of the record.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Final Office Action, page 4), a user's view access right defined by using FDN and a <u>list</u> of FDN which can be defined to indicate the number of records (*Bapat et al.*, Col. 21, lines 13-27) does NOT teach a <u>calculation expression</u> that can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one <u>state variable</u> of said database (claim 3). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is patentable for additional reasons.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Final Office Action, page 12), it is respectfully submitted that a Graphical User Interface does NOT have to be used to create a permission table. The permission table may, for example, be created through a command line or read from a file.

Per MPEP §2143.01, in order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must a motivation or suggestion <u>in</u> the combination of references. The Examiner has asserted that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to include a GUI in order to have a friendly system to define access rights for a user. However, the Examiner has not pointed to any motivation or suggestion <u>in</u> the cited art to providing a GUI that allows defining calculation expressions for a record stored in a database. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17-18, 23-26, and 35-36 is improper for these additional reasons.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections to the claims.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner

believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300